

AN ADDRESS

—BY—

PROF. J. T. KENT, A. M., M. D.,
BEFORE THE

Central New York Homœopathic Society,

AT ROCHESTER, N. Y., DEC. 17, 1885.



As we are about to enter upon a discussion that leads beyond the probability of ready comprehension, and as I may encounter, even at this centre of Hahnemannism, those who have not traveled beyond "faith" and "belief," permit me to ask my hearers to lay aside both, and with me enter upon a line of thought and investigation, and accept the outcome regardless of preconceived opinions, belief or faith. These have no part in a scientific discussion. One should proceed without opinion, without faith, without prejudice to what the statements found in the 16th section of the fifth and last edition of the Organon of Samuel Hahnemann.

The doctrines contained in this section are the result of many years of thought and classified experience and they conflict with the statements of accepted authority. But if it is the foundation of truth even in part we must explore its interior, and bow to its revelations. Though Draper and Carpenter have failed to discover these inner precincts, they have not demonstrated that Hahnemann's conclusions were illogical or impossible. With cell-formation they have ended; but life, the home of disease, is unknown to them. The opponents of this doctrine, which the followers of Hahnemann have accepted as a great truth, may search in vain and quote authority without end, and the only result attained is: Not found; not demonstrated; unknown. These authors being ignorant of this vital *dynamis* deny its existence; they cannot see it; cannot manipulate it; and cannot demonstrate it by the common instruments in chemistry and physiology. Nevertheless, the time will come when physiology must deal with this question as a factor not in dispute; then will the great void in this science be filled with that which will make medical science to rest on firm foundations; while at present from old-school standpoint it has no foundation, and with the Hahnemannian school our foundation is disputed.

As it is probable that I shall be accused of extremism, let me say, by way of explanation, that not all so-called homœopathists admit the truth of the dynamic doctrine and choose to call it "dynamic theory." There are graded believers in homœopathy as in religion. Some are born to position, others acquire it. To be born of Christian parentage does not make one a Christian. Yet believing in Christ and His teachings, without following his example or obeying his commands, will distinguish him from the Jew. In like manner believing in the *Law of Cure* makes one a homœopathist. But, like the followers of Christ, it is only possible to be an exemplary one by close relation at the throne of grace, or measuring every action by the principles under the law. Therefore it will be observed that to be an exemplary follower of the Master-healer, it is necessary to be near him, and follow after him in all his steps; that the highest degree of wisdom may appear in our methods. Not that I would blindly follow a leader who has been extensively courted; but that after discovering Hahnemann to have been the greatest living healer it behoves that we study him in all his intricate philosophy to ascertain, if possible, wherein rest his great powers as a physician, and then see whether as a healer he is worthy of followers. If we have discovered that he was an original thinker and philosopher, and his teachings are as he declared them to be, viz: the only true method of curing the sick, let us follow on as far as he has gone, not wavering a hair's breadth, until we have arrived at the point where the master left us and his great philosophy. They who practice on a part of Hahnemann's teaching and fill the great void with "results of experience," do so with methods that the master unequivocally condemned; and

while it may not be thought kindly of, the statement is true: they are not the homœopathists who have followed in the footsteps of the master. They have not lived closely to the law, and are not Hahnemannians. Hahnemann said to a friend of his in Paris, who was complimenting him on the great number of his followers. Says Hahnemann: "Yes, there are a great many homœopathic doctors, but all my true followers can be counted on the ends of my fingers."

It is as an exponent of the philosophy of Hahnemann that I speak to you, his professed followers. It is because I have learned that the Central New York Society desires to live close to the Master and learn of him, as far as he had advanced, that I have traveled so far to address you on this occult subject.

While some of the enemies of homœopathy, and some professed followers of the Law of Cure, have said that this great Master was visionary, and many harsh things, it may be well to observe that he never ceased to think with strength, and his very last thoughts are to be fully appreciated before we attempt to walk alone, or build a philosophy out of other material.

Before entering upon a fuller discussion of the statements which contain the Master's conclusion, let us look into the life of this great man, and see what manner of man was he, and how was he led to such a conclusion relating to the invisible vital *dynamis*. We want to know whether he reasoned it out by a pure mental effort, or arrived at it after the use of potentized medicines—as a result of experience.

Burnett says: "Of Hahnemann's father sufficient is known to be sure that he was no ordinary man; inasmuch as he taught the young Samuel to think for himself—for which purpose he is said to have shut him up alone and given him a theme to think out."

If Ameke's history be read it will be seen at once that Hahnemann displayed wonderful energy in securing his primary training, as his father was a man of limited means.

Everywhere facts confirm the historian, wherein he states that Hahnemann never admired metaphysical speculations; he always concluded on facts, never on theory or speculation. I refer you to his essay on "The Speculative System of Medicine," "Lesser Writings," p. 567, wherein a masterly handling of the subject was done, showing a wonderful mind and a complete knowledge of the medicine of his time which he manipulated so iconoclastically.

In 1792 he challenged the physicians to justify themselves for the treatment administered Emperor Leopold II. Even thus early the mastermind saw the perniciousness of the practice in vogue. Neither was he wanting in knowledge of many sciences.

He was the first to make the proving of drugs a system. From 1790 he continued the proving of drugs and throughout his writings he recommends the use of drugs only whose effects are accurately known, which knowledge is to be discovered only by provings upon the healthy, and this is in keeping with his manners and acts: everywhere we find exactitude of thought and method.

While translating Cullen's *Materia Medica*, in 1790, he met the latter's explanation of the action of cinchona bark in curing chills and fever. Cullen attributes the curative influence to a "strengthening power it exerts over the stomach." Hahnemann refuses to accept this explanation, and cites the following: "Substances such as strong coffee, pepper, arnica, ignatia and arsenic, which cause a kind of fever, extinguish the periodicity of fevers." "For the sake of experiment I took for several

days four drachms of good cinchona bark twice a day." The results are too well known to be recalled here; but it will be observed that Hahnemann did not refuse to accept Cullen's explanation without a reason on definite information, while Cullen's opinion was a mere speculation such as men feel compelled to offer when expected to say something. From facts Hahnemann was led to remark that species must produce certain forms of artificial fever in order to cure intermittent fever. Gradually he was advancing by deduction to the great discovery of the Law of Cure. Up to this time while he had seen the evidence, he had not formulated the *similia similibus curantur*: in fact, nothing is seen of it until 1796, in an essay which appeared in Hufeland's Journal, and is a part of the "Lesser Writings," p. 235—"Essay on a New Principle for Discovering the Curative Power of Drugs." In this paper he advises medicines in crude but small doses. "In a dose just strong enough to produce scarcely perceptible indication of the expected artificial disease." At this time he had not discovered the nature of the vital *dynamis*.

In 1801 he wrote a paper, "Cure and Prevention of Scarlet Fever," (Lesser writings, p. 367) wherein he recommended tinct. opunti, one part to 50 of alcohol, and one drop of this to be shaken with 500 of alcohol, the patient to take one drop of this preparation at a dose.

It was after 1801 that his centissima! scale was brought into use. In this year he used Bell. and Chan. in about the 3d or 4th dilution.

Very soon he discovered that "the diminution of the action of the drug was not proportionate to the diminution of its quantity." Also the astounding fact became evident "that medicines cou'd be so diluted that neither physics nor chemistry could discover any medicinal matter in them, and yet they possessed great healing power."

Hufeland says Hahnemann was the greatest chemist of his day, therefore was not in ignorance of the actual inability of the science to measure the quantity of medicine in his newly discovered healing agencies. His enemies have said he was highly educated in physics, botany, chemistry, geology, astronomy, &c., &c. His greatest and last attainment was his discovery of dynamism, which has distinguished him from all men and established a Hahnemannian that will stand as long as the world stands.

They may run away with homoeopathy and foul it into a modern nastiness, a mongrelism, and by virtue of might and numbers vote it to mean anything they choose, but they h' ve no power to change Hahnemannism, which stands and must forever stand as a living truth wherever men love truth and are not afraid to speak their true convictions. I do not favor isms; but Mr. President, in this case our only safety is to stand by this one for the simple reason that when any other name has become popular it will be stolen as the honored name of homoeopathy has been stolen, and is no longer an expression of the doctrines of Hahnemann and its most conspicuous representatives who do not make use of his methods. If an enquiring allopath seek information of one of these modern representatives he will learn nothing of the teachings of Hahnemann. Why is this? Simply because the colleges have not taught the 16th section of the *primer*. They have not taken neophytes up through the primary work, but have placed them at work with the advanced course which is never learned without the *primer*. Where have we such a parallel in other sciences? One of the conditions necessary to the successful perpetuation of this science is a knowledge of its first principles, and how to teach them.

Let us now proceed to inspect the various editions of this *Organon*, and we see what a careful man our author was. He was not a man to adopt a theory of others before having thoroughly tested it, and having observed the facts upon which the theory was based. Everywhere we see originality of thought, firmness, great power of observation, comparison, and most wonderful reasoning. Metaphysical speculation was repulsive to him, which he carefully avoided in the first edition of the *Organon*, which was published in 1810. He was eminently practical in all that he said and did. Thus you will search in vain in all the first four editions of the *Organon* for the term and idea of the vital force. He only spoke of the interior of the organism.

In the seventh section of the first edition: "There must exist in the medicine a healing principle; the understanding has a presentiment of it, but its essence is not recognizable by us in any way, only its utterances and actions can be known by experience."

Twenty-three years later, when seventy-eight years old, in the fifth edition, published in

1822, in the ninth and tenth sections, he distinctly calls a unit of action in the whole organism the vital force. From this it is evident Hahnemann arrived at this conclusion after a long and practical experience, inasmuch as he was led up to it by his early perception of the similar vital principle contained in the medicine (see first ed., 5th section), which is only recognized by its action upon the organism. I have now shown you that it was not metaphysical speculation that led the master to the idea of the vital dynamis, but a long series of practical and experimental research.

If we would think for ourselves let us inspect some of the facts that relate to general medicine and see if we can answer some of the questions that are propounded, and then revert to the vital *dynamis*. We read in the time-honored text-books that there is such a condition of the human body known as a *diathesis*—in fact, several of them; again, that these diatheses are hereditary and predispose to disease. What is this diathesis out of which grow so many diseases? In one subject comes cancer; in another insanity; in another tuberculosis; and in another epilepsy, or Bright's disease, or Hodgkin's disease. What is the stromous diathesis? What is this state of bad feeling that precedes any fixed organic change that locates in an organ? Can it be that this intent wrong in the vital power is not worthy of consideration? Can it be that the kidney can take on structural change and become waxy without cause? You must say, no! What is the cause of this lesion, and why do not these named exciting causes always produce the same results, and why does not every person subjected to these exciting causes become afflicted with waxy kidneys? You answer because there is a predisposing, determining influence at work. Yes, the diathesis. But the diathesis has no foundation in fact, only a thing of the imagination. A convenient explanation of unknown things; a figure-head in the text-books, out of which we have had no benefit, and learned no lesson from the old-school, whose literature has so wisely furnished us with a meaningless lot of terms.

We read of the weakness, of the dropsy, &c., &c., coming from Bright's disease, but we do not read of the prehistoric symptoms; are they of no value? Are they not present? Yes, they are present. Then what are they? We read of exciting and predisposing causes, but we do not read why a similar combination of exciting and predisposing causes is not always followed by Bright's disease. We have a right to ask this of a system of medicine that claims scientific attention an public patronage. Another example, if you please; we read of a self-limited disease called scariatinia (scarlet fever.) Any allopath will warm up in opposition if you tell him that scarlet fever is not a self-limited disease. If it be a self-limited disease it must result in resolution or death; the child must recover by Statute of Limitation, or—die. They do not all die; some are left even under old-school treatment to tell the tale. From these we learn that ear-discharges are the result of scariatinia. This otorrhoea is not a part of scariatinia,—according to accepted teaching—that disease is self-limited. The child was a picture of health before the scariatinia; then, what is this new trouble? Specialists treat the otorrhoea as if it were a new disease *per se*; if so, whence has it come and what is the nature of it? A novice can tell you a long name and affirm that it is catarrhal; but that is not satisfactory. Where did it come from? Did it come spontaneously, or was it the result of some latent wrong in the vital *dynamis*? I say in the *dynamis*, as there was no tissue change before, and the scariatinia has long gone. We do know that this new trouble is essentially chronic; and that in scarlet fever there is no chronic element. Now, has this sore ear simply developed at this a propitious time? Has the scariatinia so weakened the mucous membranes of the auric tubes that they became the favorite sites for the expression of a something that the disease when badly treated has aroused into action? I say when badly treated, because when the disease is properly treated, otorrhoea does not follow. I no longer see such troubles, and have not had them since I have been able to recognize their true nature. What is this something that may exist for years in a latent state—be handed down from generation to generation and come to view at any time and cause chronic troubles to follow self-limited diseases? We have a right to a civil answer to a question of this kind. If a vital wrong is capable of existing for years in an invisible state outside of the tissues, there must be some invisible precinct that stores it, or it does not exist. Can it now be doubted that a disease may exist for years with or without

a morbid anatomy? Rokitensky says scrofula has no morbid anatomy. To be logical: according to the material school, there is no scrofula and no stroma; that scrofulous manifestations have no cause, and, consequently, no reality. Why do not all injuries of the synovial membranes of the ilio-femoral articulation result in hip-joint disease? Why do some abscesses close with the evacuation of pus, and others form sinuses and fistula? Look where you may in literature other than Hahnemannian, and you will find mere speculation, theory, and no practical deduction.

Hahnemann describes three constitutional miasms that may exist in latency, that develop and progress in the vital "dynamis without" changing the tissues that may spring into destructive activity and attack organs and give shape to countless lesions called disease; that these miasms should be recognized as primary wrongs out of which grow incurable maladies, and all structural changes. Shall we learn a lesson from these reflections, or shall we pass them as mere theories? Hahnemann teaches the nature of these miasms; it is not my province to discuss them, but to simply call them up as the essentials to the complete study of the 16th section. The questions to be answered from all these are:

First - Have we such a condition as an invisible immaterial disease?

Second - If so, are all diseases of the same nature, and

Third - Is it rational to attempt to nullify a disease of immaterial nature by material substances?

Hahnemann's early deduction was that disease being of an immaterial nature could develop only on a similar basis or in a similar sphere, when in contact with a similar quality of force; and to again reach it curatively, a force must be found equally as immaterial.

The mystery of the vital force for all practical purposes in the healing art has been solved by the immortal Hahnemann, and named the vital dynamis. His deductions are summed up in the 16th section. This section furnishes the key-stone to the doctrines of Hahnemannism, and without which the great arch must flatten and collapse; without this finishing doctrine his followers would be where all are who have rejected it - floundering in the mire of uncertainty and floating in the swift and muddy rivers of guess-work and disappointment. The study of the 16th section clearly sums up what the great philosopher believed disease to be. Let us enter this wilderness and see where we are directed. If we accept the teachings we must admit that (the results of disease) lesions, tissue changes cannot be considered as primary expressions of disease, but as a consequence. The molecular vibrations or vital activities give evidence of life either changed or in equilibrium. It is life even in sickness, as death can only find expression primarily in cell changes, which is no part of our vital activities, yet a warning that a continuance of the expressions of wrong life must mean progressive death. To consider life in the sense that Hahnemann looked upon it, as normal activities within the organism, and we must then look upon these normal activities changed by cause to be abnormal, which is disease. The only evidence of disease is the definite expressions that deviate from the normal which we choose to denominate the language of the vital wrong (section 7), "Hence, the totality of these symptoms, this outwardly reflected image of the inner nature of the disease, i. e., of the suffering vital force." Localization is at all times a secondary state or the result of disease, while changed feelings are the primary manifestations. The primary or changed feelings often escape observation, as in a gonorrhœa; but the disease has been pervading the economy for a period of eight days, and the localization finally appears as a discharge. The same is true of all contagious diseases, and, as far as is known, of every disease. If we look upon disease with any other view and consider it *per se* when it localizes itself, and then search for name to fit it, by virtue of its morbid anatomy, or its location, we trace it to its observable beginning, and as though it had no cause, and study it in relation to changed cells as a something with only an ending - but with no beginning. But when looking at all tissue changes as the result of disease we are in position to inquire: What is the disease proper? This guides into the pre-historic state when there were no tissue changes, and yet there will be found ample expressions to convince us that all was not perfect in the invisible vital kingdom, where the microscope has given us no information, and the scalpel has not been directed. Then it is with this pre-historic state, these vital activities, that we have to deal. Before the change in the tissue has occurred

there must have been a cause of morbid vibrations - a condition of morbid vital activities, or cell-changes could not have been wrought. What is the nature of that state or condition that existed before the tissues and cells changed their shape? There must be two, the right and the wrong; the former the correct life function known by the absence of all subjective sensations - a feeling of bodily comfort and ease; and the latter by the presence of subjective morbid feelings. The former is known as health; and the latter as sickness or disease. These cannot be measured as a quantitative influence, as the cause is only qualitative in itself, and its results are but a perversion of a proper force. It will be as difficult to demonstrate that quantitative influence is necessary to produce vital changes as to demonstrate that there is a measurable quantity in noxious forces so hurtful to man. Therefore we may conclude that causes purely qualitative act destructively. We now have the right to assume that all vital changes primarily are only qualitative in the sense of misapplied force, and that these morbid vibrations are the disease, and all there is of disease *per se*.

Now we may assume that life is a *dynamis*, capable of perpetuating its own identity when the medium through which it acts is not destroyed or impaired. Again, to act upon the *dynamis* and not disturb the medium there must be a force brought in relation with the vital force equally as qualitative and as free from quantitative consideration. It hardly needs further demonstration to show that this vital perversion is possible, but we observe daily the wrong feelings that have been known to exist for years without quantitative changes or localization. Thus have we arrived at Hahnemann's conclusion. But now we glean that an equally subtle dynamis is necessary to cause disease and disturb the harmonious relations of the vital activities, and it is admitted that the law of *Similaris* expresses the curative relation and the only law of the kind known to man, must we not conclude that this curative power or force to be a corrective principle must be equally qualitative and subtle with the life principle, with the disease cause, with the disease itself? The vital affinity cannot appear between forces of foreign relations; they must be *similar* in quality and devoid of quantity. Power used in the sense of overpowering an antagonist has no place in the science of homeopathics; but it is a consideration of a given force deranged or perverted to be simply harmonized and restored to equilibrium.

It will at once be observed that a surplus of force is impossible only as a surplus in a qualitative relation which has no part in the similitude of a purely qualitative problem. To attain the highest degree of similitude, not the quantity of a given power is the aim. The similar in quality with similar expressions of activity is the *sime qua non*, as we have demonstrated that there is no quantity necessary in the consideration. Therefore if this be only a spirit-like dynamis - and I believe the demonstration is clear - all of the quantity taken or made use of must be that much more than similar, therefore unlike, and that much more than the demand to restore equilibrium; in other words, contrary and in no relation curative, not in any sense restorative, but, on the contrary, retard the return to normal vibration by impairing the medium through which the vital dynamis must operate. In relation to cure it has so often been said by the Master, there was yet too much medicine to cure; the dose is yet too large to cure. The use of the term quantity conveys the idea of strength which has no part in any homeopathic sense as related to a curative agency. To reduce remedial agents to primitive identity of a qualitative character only that they may act through the new medium is the aim of the true healer. Not until they are divested of their own media can they be quickly corrective, or be active in any sense as similar agencies.

This view may appear to oppose some statements of Hahnemann. In section 45, "The stronger disease will overcome the weaker one." This is only apparent. The two diseases being partially similar overcome each other only in part, but the part of the one overcome only in part reproduces itself and runs its course un molest. In section 34, "for it is by virtue of the similitude, combined with greater intensity." This statement may be correct, but I believe it to be only apparent, and that the similitude is the only necessary demand for the destruction of both, or rather the correction of the wrong in the dynamis or spirit-like vital force. There being no entity there can be nothing to overpower, only a perverted effort to be corrected. Any disease will

subside apparently by natural decline when met by a noxious influence of similar dynamis, or sick-making possibilities regardless of intensity. This view strengthens the Law of Similars, and is in harmony with immaterial activities. It is not adding a new force, but applying a force to correct a perverted life principle.

The noxious disease-producing influences have nothing in common with material agencies. When so crude that they can be seen and manipulated they are feeble sick-making agencies. [The skeptical experimenters, in provings made with attenuations, forgot that a special predisposition is frequently necessary for contagion, and that this predisposition cannot be made to order, but must be utilized when found, which affords a propitious opportunity for the pure experiment through which we discover the sick-making power of drugs.] (Sect. 31.) The dangerous and most noxious agencies are of the unknown. The most astute have failed to find the cholera or yellow fever causes. The cause of small-pox is yet unknown. The subtle influence that in one stroke swoops down upon a village is not measurable by our crude senses. The small-pox poison when attenuated with millions of volumes of atmospheric air comes to the surface through the maws and through old clothing by inhalation, and the slightest contact. The impression wrought upon this spirit-like dynamis accumulates until the medium is threatened with destruction, all from a simple perverted life force.

In this 16th section: "Neither can the physician free the vital force from any of these morbid disturbances." No, because the life force being an immaterial force like electricity, there is nothing to purge out, nor puke out, but a simple vital perversion to be corrected and as the wrong is essentially immaterial, nothing but an immaterial something can be similar enough to it to act upon it as a corrective. A material substance may change the organism and thereby suppress or suspend an immaterial wrong, but the latter will return so soon as the former, its medium, resumes its normal conductivity. It will be observed at once that the essentials of cure do not exist in operations upon the organisms, and as material substances operate largely through the organisms, the true disease is not reached. The object then must be to avoid operating upon the organism and essentially through the vital impulses by correcting the perverted vital activities. The causes of disease existing in a highly attenuated form are similar in equality to the vital *dynamis*; hence the affinity or susceptibility. This same affinity must be acquired by a drug substance. The attenuation must be carried on until a correspondence of spheres has been reached, or until resistance is no longer possible. The point of the highest degree of similitude in quality between two activities is variable, as it is in a degree observable¹⁴ in a very wide range of attenuation; as, many quick cures are observed from low attenuations, but, more commonly, the high and highest attenuations furnish the most striking examples. That low potencies cure, nobody disputes; and this does not refute the doctrine, but it must be admitted that it is by virtue of the inherent dynamic principle that is curative, though more feebly curative in the low than when the drug is attenuated to a quality equal to the quality of the attenuated disease cure and the qualitative vital *dynamis*. The striking changes sometimes observed from low attenuations are the results of primary action on the organism which Hahnemann seeks to avoid. To bring about such results medicines must be repeated while a single dose of the attenuated medicine would prove curative, and not influence the organism primarily. From a practical stand-point let us look upon the results of obeying the instructions of the Master, who was always guided in his later years by the doctrines of the sixteenth section, and contrast them with the results of those who disobey this teaching.

The former class has followed closely the Master's teachings, accepting the dynamic doctrine, and in this line have they made their cures, with the same evidence claimed by the other class, simply the patients recover. They have not felt the need of other methods than those taught by Hahnemann. They have not gone backwards, but, on the contrary, they have made some progress. How have they progressed? Let us see. If you will consult section 41 of the Organon you will see. Here we see that Hahnemann declares it almost impossible to eradicate some diseases because they had been complicated with drugs having no relation to the disease. He says that his remedies were always capable of curing effectively all simple diseases. Hahnemann then used but the 30th cent. potency when this section

was written with few exceptions. What have his faithful followers to say as proof of the truth of the doctrines and a proof of progress? That many of these most complicated diseases can be wiped out. That the drug symptoms can be subdued by very high attenuations, leaving the simple original disease to manifest itself through the natural medium, when it can be cured by the 30th potency of the Master. They who have rejected this doctrine as a dogma have never seen this work and they never will. Yes, we shall progress if we observe facts, and unflinchingly cling to the doctrines of the immortal Hahnemann. Let us look at the contrast. What can be said of this class. Their cures are only a deception. Had they really cured their cases they would not need to resort to the latest whim of an empirical profession. They have abandoned the teaching of the 16th section and what is the result? They know that they cannot cure the sick, and they even refuse to believe that any one else can. You never dispute a cure where it is in keeping with your daily observations. They say thatague must have quinine, when the follower of the Master cures all his cases with the attenuated appropriate remedy. The *Materia Medica* that has been found so satisfactory in the hands of Hahnemann and his followers has been a failure and it needs revising. There must be something wrong and we want no greater evidence of their failure than that the chief defamer, J. P. Daké, requires in his practice a large stock of Warner's sugar coated pills, composed of crude medicines. If this is true of the chief, what in the name of heaven must the lesser lights need, who must, of course, be less skilled? They have declared that any one who simply selects his remedy under the *Law of Similars* is as high as he can attain in the art of healing; and he may thereafter cover his patients with mustard, and apply all the local measures he chooses. Even they say that the local treatment is assisted by the internal remedy.

The first departure from the dynamic doctrine is dangerous and leads towards non-success, and careless method is the outcome. Safety comes from simply not following the law of selection, but also the teaching of the 16th section must be heeded. Look at the alternation departure, and see the laziness of his thoughts. Examine the prescription-file in any drug store of a large city. What do you find? Simply a lot of prescriptions called homoeopathic whose only element of homoeopathy is the signature of a long professed homoeopathic practitioner.

Hahnemann regarded this vital dynamis as a unit of force (see section 15) and the departure from health as a unit of force. We cannot study the 16th section and ignore this portion of the dynamic doctrine. How absurd must it appear to one who has a clear comprehension of these truths to consider for one moment the problem of alternation which the Master has so unequivocally condemned in section 272, and its note. Take a mental state that clearly indicates *nux vomica*, and associate it with a pulsatilla menstrual condition, with menses too late, scanty and pale. In the former pulsatilla is contra-indicated by the crabbed temper; in the latter *nux* is contra-indicated by the conditions of the menstrual flow. The two, therefore, are contra-indicated, neither of them corresponding to the unit of force known by the totality of symptoms. Can it be possible that by combining them it will make either or both homoeopathic to the demand of this unit? Hahnemann everywhere speaks of using only such medicines as are accurately understood by having been proved on the healthy human body. Here we have a compound about which little is known. Can it appear rational to suppose, or assume that with a compound unknown, composed of elements neither of which is homoeopathic to this unit of force, that they can act uniformly curatively? These departures, wherein the doctrine of the 16th section is not needed, are the foundation of all ill-success; of the cry for a revised *Materia Medica*, and of so-called modern homoeopathy. I must say again, that modern homoeopathy is built out of the departures from the doctrines of the immortal Hahnemann. These men have found the *Materia Medica* so inadaptable to their wants, that a majority of their prescriptions are composed of crude drugs. These departingists have so departed from the methods of Hahnemann that the homoeopathic profession as a mass to-day is but a caricature, having violated every principle of the philosophy that has anything distinctive.

They may find momentary comfort in it, but every true man must feel like uttering: "Father forgive them, they know not what they do."